

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

CARL YANCY (TDCJ No. 1433033),	§ § § § § § § §	
Plaintiff,	§ § § § § § § §	
V.	§ § § § § § § §	No. 3:15-cv-604-K-BN
DALLAS COUNTY 265th DISTRICT COURT, ET AL.	§ § § § § § § §	
Defendant.	§ § § § § § § §	

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

This case has been referred to the United States magistrate judge for case management pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and a standing order of reference from the District Court. The undersigned magistrate judge issues the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation.

Background

Plaintiff Carl Yancy, a Texas inmate proceeding *pro se*, has filed a motion for writ of mandamus, requesting that this Court compel a state court to rule on his state application for habeas relief. *See generally* Dkt. No. 3.

The undersigned now concludes that this case should be dismissed as frivolous.

Legal Standards

A district court may summarily dismiss a complaint filed *in forma pauperis* if it concludes that the action:

- (i) is frivolous or malicious;
- (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or
- (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *see, e.g., Franklin v. Ritchie*, Civ. A. No. H-09-3243, 2009 WL 3275673, at *1 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 9, 2009) (a court may make this determination “[n]otwithstanding any filing fee, or any portion thereof, that may have been paid”).

An action is frivolous if it lacks an arguable basis in either law or fact. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *see also Brewster v. Dretke*, 587 F.3d 764, 767 (5th Cir. 2009) (“A claim may be dismissed as frivolous if it does not have an arguable basis in fact or law.”). A complaint is without an arguable basis in law if it is grounded upon an untenable, discredited, or indisputably meritless legal theory, including alleged violations of a legal interest that clearly does not exist. *See Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 326-27; *Berry v. Brady*, 192 F.3d 504, 507 (5th Cir. 1999).

The Court must “accept all well-pleaded facts as true, viewing them in the light most favorable to the plaintiff.” *In re Katrina Canal Breaches Litig.*, 495 F.3d 191, 205-06 (5th Cir. 2007). To state a claim upon which relief may be granted, Plaintiff must plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face,” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007), and must plead those facts with enough specificity “to raise a right to relief above the speculative level,” *id.* at 555. “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.”

Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). “The plausibility standard is not akin to a ‘probability requirement,’ but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully.” *Id.* “A claim for relief is implausible on its face when ‘the well-pleaded facts do not permit the court to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct.’” *Harold H. Huggins Realty, Inc. v. FNC, Inc.*, 634 F.3d 787, 796 (5th Cir. 2011) (quoting *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679).

While, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2), a complaint need not contain detailed factual allegations, Plaintiff must allege more than labels and conclusions, and, while the Court must accept all of Plaintiff’s allegations as true, it is “not bound to accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555). A threadbare or formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, will not suffice. *See id.*

But, “to survive a motion to dismiss[,]” under *Twombly* and *Iqbal*, Plaintiff need only “plead facts sufficient to show” that the claims asserted have “substantive plausibility” by stating “simply, concisely, and directly events” that Plaintiff contends entitle him to relief. *Johnson v. City of Shelby, Miss.*, 574 U.S. ___, 135 S. Ct. 346, 347 (2014) (per curiam) (citing FED. R. CIV. P. 8(a)(2)-(3), (d)(1), (e)).

28 U.S.C. § 1331 provides “district courts [with] original jurisdiction of any action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or agency of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff.” *Id.*

Analysis

Plaintiff's request for a federal writ of mandamus, presumably under Section 1361, to compel the state judiciary to rule on his application for a state writ of habeas corpus lacks an arguable basis in law – and is therefore frivolous – because “[f]ederal courts lack the general power to issue writs of mandamus to direct state courts and their judicial officers in the performance of their duties.” *Moore v. 204th Dist. Ct.*, No. 3:08-cv-2281-D, 2009 WL 3150983, at *3 (N.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2009) (citing *Moye v. Clerk, Dekalb Cnty. Sup.Ct.*, 474 F.2d 1275, 1276 (5th Cir. 1973); *Santee v. Quinlan*, 115 F.3d 355, 357 (5th Cir. 1997) (affirming dismissal of petition for writ of mandamus as frivolous because federal courts lack the power to mandamus state courts in the performance of their duties)); *see also Franklin*, 2009 WL 3275673, at *2 (dismissing similar petition for writ of mandamus as frivolous and, alternatively, for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted under Section 1361).

Recommendation

This action should be dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). And Plaintiff's pending motions – to dismiss the State's original facts, findings, and conclusions of law and for an evidentiary hearing, *see* Dkt. Nos. 4 and 5 – should be denied as moot.

A copy of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or

recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).

DATED: February 24, 2015



DAVID L. HORAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE